

REMARKS

Claims 6-8 and 11-28 are pending in this application, of which claims 6, 12, 18 and 23 have been amended. No new claims have been added.

The Examiner has maintained from the previous Office Action all of the prior art rejections of the claims based on various combinations of Tate, Vinther et al. and Kagami.

Applicants respectfully traverse all of these rejections.

In the Response to Arguments section of the Office Action, the Examiner stated:

Regarding claim 6 rejected over Tate, Applicant argues that the reference does not teach a columnar member having a first end and a second end and a through hole extending entirely through the columnar member from the first end to the second end.

However, an element 30 having both ends opened was recited as a columnar member.

Applicants respectfully disagree. First, element 30 of Tate does not correspond to the columnar member 13a of the instant application because it is described as a "retainer", which is received within a bore 28 included in terminal housing 14, as disclosed in column 3, lines 39-46. The retainer is a mere shell having fingers at one end for retaining spring 22.

Second, the contact member 17 of Tate is not integrally formed on the first end of the columnar member, as disclosed in paragraph [0029] of the specification of the instant application.

Accordingly, claims 6 and 23 have been amended to recite this distinction.

The Examiner has also stated:

Regarding claim 18 rejected over Vinther et al. Applicant argues that the reference does not teach a columnar member (18) having a first end and a second end and a through hole extending entirely through the columnar member from the first end to the second end.

However, it is not claimed that the second end (22) has an opening. The through hole extends from r.n. 20 to r.n. 51 which is a top surface of the second end.

The same response would applicable to claim 6, if element 14 is interpreted as a columnar member with through hole.

Applicants respectfully disagree. Both ends of the columnar member 13a in the instant application have openings which are connected by the through hole 13g. In contrast, base surface 51 plugs up one end of barrel 18 in Vinther et al.

Accordingly, claims 6, 12, 18 and 23 have been amended to recite this distinction.

Kagami has been cited for disclosing the columnar member having the end (125) of the through hole with different inner diameters, but like the other cited references, fails to teach, mention or suggest the features recited in the amendments to claims 12 and 18, from which these claims respectively depend.

Thus, all of the prior art rejections should be withdrawn.

The claims are now in condition for further examination.

The Director is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in the fees filed, asserted to be filed or which should have been filed herewith (or with any paper hereafter filed in this application by this firm) to our Deposit Account No. 04-1105.

Dated: August 7, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

CUSTOMER NO.: 21874

By William L. Brooks
William L. Brooks
Registration No.: 34,129
EDWARDS ANGELL PALMER & DODGE
LLP
P.O. Box 55874
Boston, Massachusetts 02205
(202) 478-7376
Attorneys/Agents For Applicant